

Legislature, and we need to get her out of there. And the man said, well, I make my living selling houses, not handing out cards at polling places. And he says, well, I'm telling you that Marge Higgins is bad for the real estate industry and we are expecting you to get out there and work for her opponent. And the man looked at little Herbie Freeman and he said, I can't do that, Herbie, she's my cousin. And another person that worked for CBS told me the same thing. So I say to the senator that came to me this morning and gave me what would be good advice if I was looking for votes and for money for a gubernatorial race, it would be wise and it would be smart to drop these amendments and to let this bill go as watered down as it is, but I, to paraphrase someone else, I'd rather be right than be Governor. So I won't withdraw the amendments and I will offer this one and I won't spend any more time on it. This is just the one that says once they enter into the agreement, they have three days for a cooling off period. I expect as many red lights on this as I have had all morning on the other amendments. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, I think the discussion has been very beneficial and I think it's clear two things have developed out of the discussion. One is the philosophy of "government involvement", intervention, whatever you want to call it, to protect consumer rights from perceived problems or perceived evils that are occurring. The other is the situation is okay, the marketplace is working and government intervention is not necessary. Now, Senator Higgins said something a few minutes ago that I think is the most important statement she has made on this issue and it went something like this. You've watered the bill down to where it means nothing so you can vote for it. You've taken all the guts out of it and made it into just something that can't be enforced and is ineffective just so you can vote for it and say you voted for consumer rights. My answer to her is I agree with her. That is what has occurred with the bill and, therefore, I'll probably not support it for two reasons. One, I'm one of those that believes less government intervention is proper in the marketplace and the evils that occur, and there will be some and there have been some, can be over time and will be corrected by the marketplace rather than government intervention and that there is no way you can develop any system that "totally